

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are all the claims pending in the application.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner alleges that some of the features of Applicant's invention are not "explicitly" specified in the claims (see Advisory Action, page 2).

Accordingly, Applicant's representative telephoned the Examiner to arrange an interview to discuss the claims.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting a telephonic interview with Applicant's representative on February 12, 2004 and a follow up telephonic interview on March 4, 2004. The following constitutes a reply to the Office Action dated September 24, 2003 in view of the Advisory Action dated January 20, 2004, and a summary of the substance of the interviews conducted with the Examiner on February 12, 2004 and March 4, 2004.

During the February 12, 2004 interview, the Examiner acknowledged that Masukane does not disclose a display where digital information data originating from one signal is displayed at outsides of the displaying region of a digital RGB data originating from another signal, as required by Applicant's independent claim 1. However, the Examiner noted that the term "displayed at outsides" (as recited in claim 1) is not sufficiently descriptive, and at the conclusion of the interview agreed that adding clarifying language such as "without overlap" should make the recitation sufficiently descriptive. Applicant's representative noted to the Examiner that such an amendment would be merely a clarifying amendment and would not narrow the scope of claim 1.

In the Examiner's Interview Summary, mailed February 18, 2004, the Examiner states that, during the February 12, 2004 interview, "Examiner suggested to Applicant to narrow down the claim language" Applicant respectfully submits that, while this statement correctly states the Examiner's suggestion at the outset of the interview, the actual clarifying claim language, namely "without overlap", which was agreed upon at the conclusion of the interview does not narrow the scope of the original claim 1.

In order to confirm that amending claim 1 to recite "without overlap" would not change the scope of the original claim 1, Applicant's representative conducted another telephonic interview with the Examiner on March 4, 2003. Applicant thanks the Examiner for taking the time to conduct this additional telephonic interview.

During the March 4, 2004 interview, the Examiner confirmed that the proposed amendment to claim 1 (as discussed at the conclusion of the February 12, 2004 interview, and as set forth in this Amendment) is merely a clarifying amendment, and does not narrow the scope of the original claim 1, which implicitly required that the digital information data is displayed with third digital RGB signals "without overlap" by reciting that "said digital information data are displayed at outsides of a display region of said third digital RGB signals" (original claim 1).

Thus, the amendment to claim 1 as set forth herein does not narrow the scope of claim 1. No estoppel is created by this amendment.

Since Masukane does not disclose, teach or suggest a display where digital information data originating from one signal is displayed at outsides of the displaying region of a digital RGB data originating from another signal, as required by Applicant's independent claim 1, Applicant's

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Appln No. 09/853,634

Atty Dkt No. Q64483

claim 1, as well as its dependent claims 2-6 (which incorporate all the novel and unobvious features of their base claim) would not have been obvious from Masukane at least for this reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Stan Torgovitsky
Registration No. 43,958

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 23 ,2004